12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

In re:

1	Annette W. Jarvis, Utah Bar No. 1649
2	Steven C. Strong, Utah Bar No. 6340 RAY QUINNEY & NEBEKER P.C. 36 South State Street, Suite 1400
3	P.O. Box 45385
	Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0385
4	Telephone: (801) 532-1500
	Facsimile: (801) 532-7543
5	Email: ajarvis@rqn.com
6	Lenard E. Schwartzer, Nevada Bar No. 0399
7	Jeanette E. McPherson, Nevada Bar No. 5423 SCHWARTZER & MCPHERSON LAW FIRM
8	2850 South Jones Boulevard, Suite 1 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146-5308
9	Telephone: (702) 228-7590 Facsimile: (702) 892-0122
10	E-Mail: <u>bkfilings@s-mlaw.com</u>

Attorneys for Debtors and Debtors-in-Possession

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE COMPANY,
Debtor.
In re:
USA CAPITAL REALTY ADVISORS, LLC,
Debtor.
In re:
USA CAPITAL DIVERSIFIED TRUST DEED FUND,
LLC,
Debtor.
In re:
USA CAPITAL FIRST TRUST DEED FUND, LLC,
Debtor.
In re:
USA SECURITIES, LLC,
Debtor.
Affects:
☐ All Debtors
■ USA Commercial Mortgage Company
☐ USA Capital Realty Advisors, LLC
☐ USA Capital Diversified Trust Deed Fund, LLC
☐ USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC
☐ USA Securities, LLC

Case No. BK-S-06-10725 LBR Case No. BK-S-06-10726 LBR Case No. BK-S-06-10727 LBR Case No. BK-S-06-10728 LBR Case No. BK-S-06-10729 LBR

Chapter 11

Jointly Administered Under Case No. BK-S-06-10725 LBR

REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING RETENTION PLAN OF DEBTOR'S **REMAINING EMPLOYEES**

E-FILED ON OCTOBER 18, 2006

(AFFECTS USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE COMPANY)

Date: October 19, 2006

Time: 9:30 a.m.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

USA Commercial Mortgage Company ("USACM") hereby submits this Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion for Order Approving Retention Plan of Debtor's Remaining Employees (the "Motion") (docket no. 1429).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- USACM filed the Motion on October 3, 2006, seeking approval of a retention plan 1. (the "Retention Plan") to encourage USACM's remaining eleven (11) employees to stay with USACM through confirmation of a plan of reorganization.
- 2. On October 6, 2006, the Official Committee of Equity Security Holders of USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC (the "FTDF Committee") filed its response to the Motion (docket no. 1470) in which it indicated that it had no objection to the Motion as long as the Retention Plan was funded by USACM's estate and not by USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC.
- 3. On October 12, 2006, the United States Trustee (the "UST") filed an opposition to the Motion (docket no. 1520) in which the UST objected to the approval of the Retention Plan on the grounds that: (a) funds from the Collection Account could not be used to fund the Retention Plan; (b) 11 U.S.C. § 503(c) is the statutory section that applies to the Motion; and (c) approval allegedly is not justified by the facts and circumstances of this case.
- On October 13, 2006, a group of direct lenders known as the "JV Direct Lenders" 4. joined in the opposition (docket no. 1537) filed by the UST but did not advance any new arguments.
- 5. USACM files this reply memorandum to respond to the arguments raised by the UST and to support the Motion.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

The Opposition of the UST, as Joined by the JV Direct Lenders, Lacks Merit A. Because the Facts and Circumstances of This Case Justify Approval of the Retention Plan.

First, the UST objects to the Motion on the ground that it is silent as to the source of funds that will be used to fund the Retention Plan, and that the funds in the Collection Account should

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

not be used to fund the Retention Plan. USACM's own funds in its operating account will be used to fund the Retention Plan, just as USACM's own funds are being used to pay employees' ordinary salaries and benefits. Except for servicing fees and other costs and fees USACM is entitled under the loan servicing agreements or by Court order to transfer to its operating account, funds in the Collection Account are not being used and will not be used in these cases to pay USACM's overhead and administrative expenses. Funds held in the Collection Account will not be used to fund the Retention Plan, nor will any funds be used from the estate of USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC to fund the Retention Plan.

Second, the UST objects to USACM's contention that 11 U.S.C. § 503(c) does not apply in this case, and instead argues that 11 U.S.C. § 503(c)(3) does apply. As a clarification, USACM should have stated more precisely in its Motion that Sections 503(c)(1) and 503(c)(2) do not apply in this case because none of the remaining eleven (11) employees are "insiders" of USACM as that term is defined in the Bankruptcy Code. USACM does not dispute that the approval of the funding of the Retention Plan is outside of the ordinary course of business and that the facts and circumstances of this case must justify the approval of the Retention Plan under 11 U.S.C. § 363(b) and/or 11 U.S.C. § 503(c)(3). USACM contends that the facts and circumstances of this case do justify the approval of the Retention Plan, as set forth in the Motion and the Declaration of Thomas J. Allison filed in support of the Motion.

Third, the UST objects to the Motion on the ground that the UST does not believe that the facts and circumstances of this case justify the approval of the Retention Plan, and the UST outlines three reasons as support for this contention. First, the UST argues that the pre-petition actions of USACM caused the Debtors' creditors to suffer significant losses, and because of the magnitude of those losses, USACM should not be requesting approval of additional incentives for its employees. Second, the UST argues that if the Retention Plan is approved, the extra money required to fund the Retention Plan will not be available to pay the pre-petition claims of creditors. Third, the UST argues that the proposed incentives are in addition to the employees' existing ordinary salaries and that the additional amounts should not be paid to employees of the business that caused the creditors of the Debtors to suffer their losses in the first place.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

In making the foregoing arguments, the UST misapprehends the necessity and reasons for the Retention Plan. USACM is not seeking approval of the Retention Plan in order to provide a windfall to the eleven remaining employees of USACM in the form of bonuses and other incentives. Rather, the goal of USACM's current management has been and will continue to be to maximize the recovery for creditors and other stakeholders of the Debtors' estates, and a critical part of achieving that goal is to keep the current skeleton staff of employees in place so that USACM's business operations can continue to run as smoothly as possible for the next few months while the Debtors' business affairs are wound up and current management works toward the confirmation of a plan of reorganization. If the remaining employees choose to leave USACM at this critical time for more steady employment, and take with them their institutional knowledge of the USACM's business operations, this will make running the USACM's business much more difficult and expensive to the detriment of creditors.

To the extent USACM's creditors ultimately receive less than a full recovery on their prepetition claims, those losses were not caused by the eleven remaining employees of USACM, but rather by the Debtors' pre-petition management which has been removed and which will not benefit in any way from the Retention Plan.

Moreover, USACM's current management believes that approving the Retention Plan will actually save money in the long run. The UST appears to wrongly assume that if the Retention Plan is not approved, the remaining employees of USACM will be happy to continue working for the company through the effective date of a plan of reorganization without any additional compensation for their very tenuous employment status. There is no support for this unrealistic assumption. If the additional incentives are not approved, the remaining employees of USACM have indicated they will leave USACM for other employment, which is not surprising given that they have no prospect of long term employment with USACM and therefore have no reason to stay absent some incentive to do so. Losing the few remaining current employees will be much more costly to USACM's estate because current management will then have no recourse but to employ other individuals and/or consultants whose billing rates undoubtedly will be much higher than what is proposed to be paid to the remaining employees under the Retention Plan.

Tel: (702) 228-7590 · Fax: (702) 892-0122

3	USACN
4	
5]
6	USACM
7]
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	896844v2
22	
23	
24	
25	
26 27	
27	

28

1

2

Accordingly, approval of the Retention Plan will save money in the long run, and therefore, is
justified under the facts and circumstances of this case and is for the benefit of creditors of
USACM's estate.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, as well as the arguments set forth in its original memorandum, USACM requests that the Court grant the Motion.

Dated this _____ day of October, 2006.

Annette W. Jarvis, Utah Bar No. 1649 Steven C. Strong, Utah Bar No. 6340 RAY QUINNEY & NEBEKER P.C. 36 South State Street, Suite 1400 P.O. Box 45385 Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0385 and

/s/ Jeanette E. McPherson

Lenard E. Schwartzer, Nevada Bar No. 0399 Jeanette E. McPherson, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 5423 SCHWARTZER & MCPHERSON LAW FIRM 2850 South Jones Boulevard, Suite 1 Las Vegas NV 89146 Attorneys for Debtors and Debtors-in-Possession

2850 South Jones Boulevard, Suite 1 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146-5308 Tel: (702) 228-7590 · Fax: (702) 892-0122

JANET L. CHUBB

JEFFREY A. COGAN

CICI CUNNINGHAM

WILLIAM D COPE

<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>
1. On October 18, 2006, I served the following document(s):
a. REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING RETENTION PLAN OF DEBTOR'S REMAINING EMPLOYEES(AFFECTS USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE COMPANY)
2. I served the above-named document(s) by the following means to the persons as listed below:
a. <u>By ECF System</u> :
FRANKLIN C. ADAMS franklin.adams@bbklaw.com, arthur.johnston@bbklaw.com
NANCY L ALLF nallf@parsonsbehle.com, klawrence@parsonsbehle.com;tthomas@parsonsbehle.com;ecf@parsonsbehle.com
OGONNA M. ATAMOH oatamoh@nevadafirm.com, bkecf@nevadafirm.com;paltstatt@nevadafirm.com;sliberio@nevadafirm.com
KERIANN M ATENCIO ATENCIOK@GTLAW.COM
BMC GROUP, INC. evrato@bmcgroup.com, ecf@bmcgroup.com;jmiller@bmcgroup.com;jbartlett@bmcgroup.com
KELLY J. BRINKMAN kbrinkman@gooldpatterson.com
THOMAS R BROOKSBANK tom@tombrooksbank.com, renee@tombrooksbank.com
ANDREW M. BRUMBY abrumby@shutts-law! .com, rhicks@shutts-law.com;lmackson@shutts-law.com
MATTHEW Q. CALLISTER mqc@callister-reynolds.com, maggie@callister-reynolds.com
CANDACE C CARLYON treadway@sheacarlyon.com, ccarlyon@sheacarlyon.com;bankruptcyfilings@sheacarlyon.com;rmsmith@sheacarlyon.com
ROB CHARLES rcharles@lrlaw.com, cjordan@lrlaw.com
MICHAEL W. CHEN yvette@ccfirm.com
KEVIN B. CHRISTENSEN kbchrislaw@aol.com

jeffrey@jeffreycogan.com, sarah@jeffreycogan.com

tbw@jonesvargas.com

cope guerra@yahoo.com

bankruptcy@rocgd.com

1	LA UREL E. DAVIS bklsclv@lionelsawyer.com, ldavis@lionelsawyer.com;gbagley@lionelsawyer.com;ldavisesq@aol.com
$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	DEBT ACQUISITION COMPANY OF AMERICA V, LLC (tf) tfette@daca4.com
4	THOMAS H. FELL BANKRUPTCYNOTICES@GORDONSILVER.COM
5	SCOTT D. FLEMING sfleming@halelane.com, dbergsing@halelane.com,ecfvegas@halelane.com
6	GREGORY E GARMAN bankruptcynotices@gordonsilver.com
7	WADE B. GOCHNOUR wgochnour@hwmlvlaw.com, donnat@hwmlvlaw.com
8	CARLOS A. GONZALEZ carlos.gonzalez2@usdoj.gov, Darlene.Ruckard@usdoj.gov;Eunice.Jones@usdoj.gov;Sue.Knight@usdoj.gov
10	GERALD M GORDON bankruptcynotices@gordonsilver.com
11	R. VAUGHN GOURLEY vgourley@lvcm.com
12	TALITHA B. GRAY bankruptcynotices@gordonsilver.com
13	JAMES D. GREENE bknotice@schrecklaw.com
14	MARJORIE A. GUYMON bankruptcy@goldguylaw.com, ddias@goldguylaw.com
15 16	JEFFREY R. HALL jhall@sheacarlyon.com, bankruptcyfilings@sheacarlyon.com;aboehmer@sheacarlyon.com;ltreadway@sheacarlyon.com;rsmith@sheacarlyon.com
17	XANNA R. HARDMAN xanna.hardman@gmail.com
18	STEPHEN R HARRIS noticesbh&p@renolaw.biz
19	BRIGID M. HIGGINS bankruptcynotices@gordonsilver.com
20	DAVID W. HUSTON dwh@hustonlaw.net, swaits@hustonlaw.net
21	CHRISTOPHER D JAIME cjai! me@walth erkey.com, kbernhar@waltherkey.com
22	EVAN L. JAMES ejameslv@earthlink.net, kbchrislaw@aol.com
23	TY E. KEHOE TyKehoeLaw@aol.com
24	ROBERT R. KINAS rkinas@swlaw.com,
25	mstrand@swlaw.com;jlustig@swlaw.com;chaines@swlaw.com;imccord@swlaw.com
26 27	ZACHARIAH LARSON ecf@lslawnv.com
28	JOHN J. LAXAGUE jlaxague@caneclark.com GEORGE C LAZAR glazar@foxjohns.com, gclazar@sbcglobal.net

	1	NILE LEATHAM nleatham@klnevada.com, ckishi@klnevada.com;bankruptcy@klnevada.com
	2	ROBERT C. LEPOME robert@robertlepome.com, susan@robertlepome.com
	3	ANNE M. LORADITCH ! ecffilings@beckleylaw.com,
	4	aloraditch@beckleylaw.com;pkois@beckleylaw.com
	5	REGINA M. MCCONNELL rmcconnell@kssattorneys.com
	6	WILLIAM L. MCGIMSEY lawoffices601@lvcoxmail.com
	7	RICHARD MCKNIGHT mcknightlaw@cox.net, gkopang@lawlasvegas.com;cburke@lawlasvegas.com
	8 9	SHAWN W MILLER bankruptcyfilings@sheacarlyon.com, smiller@sheacarlyon.com;aboehmer@sheacarlyon.com;ltreadway@sheacarlyon.com;rsmith@sheacarlyon.com
	10	DAVID MINCIN mcknightlaw@cox.net,
	11	gkopang@lawlasvegas.com;dmincin@lawlasvegas.com,cburke@lawlasvegas.com
ı	12	JOHN F MURTHA jmurtha@woodburnandwedge.com!
	13	ERVEN T. NELSON erv@rlbolick.com, susan@rlbolick.com
	14	VICTORIA L NELSON bkecf@nevadafirm.com, vnelson@nevadafirm.com;paltstatt@nevadafirm.com;rholley@nevadafirm.com;sliberio@nevadafirm.com
	15	BOB L. OLSON ecffilings@beckleylaw.com, bolson@beckleylaw.com;dgriffis@beckleylaw.com
	16 17	DONNA M. OSBORN ebaker@marquisaurbach.com, dosborn@marquisaurbach.com;tszostek@marquisaurbach.com;kgallegos@MarquisAurbach.com
	18	ANDREW M. PARLEN aparlen@stutman.com
	19	DONALD T. POLEDNAK sandplegal@yahoo.com, spbankruptcy@yahoo.com
	20	PAUL C RAY info@johnpeterlee.com
	21	SUSAN WILLIAMS SCANN sscann@deanerlaw.com, pale! xander@deanerlaw.com
	22	JAMES PATRICK SHEA bankruptcyfilings@sheacarlyon.com,
	23	ltreadway@sheacarlyon.com;rmsmith@sheacarlyon.com
	24	SHLOMO S. SHERMAN ssherman@sheacarlyon.com,
	25	aboehmer@sheacarlyon.com;bankruptcyfilings@sheacarlyon.com;ltreadway@sheacarlyon.com;rsmith@eacarlyon.com
	26	AMBRISH S. SIDHU ecf@lslawnv.com
	27	JEFFREY G. SLOANE gjklepel@yahoo.com, rmcconnell@kssattorneys.com

dstephens@lvcm.com

DAVID A. STEPHENS

28

1	PETER SUSI cheryl@msmlaw.com, msm@msmlaw.com
2	JEFFREY R. SYLVESTER jeff@sylvesterpolednak.com, David@sylvesterpolednak.c! om
3	CARYN S. TIJSSELING! &n bsp cst@beesleymatteoni.com, aha@beesleymatteoni.com
4	AMY N TIRRE atirre@kkbrf.com, ksims@kkbrf.com;lleverett@kkbrf.com
5	U.S. TRUSTEE - LV - 11 USTPRegion17.lv.ecf@usdoj.gov
6	GREGORY J. WALCH GWalch@Nevadafirm.com
7	WHITNEY B. WARNICK wbw@albrightstoddard.com, bstessel@albrightstoddard.com
8	JOAN C WRIGHT jwright@allisonmackenzie.com, jbrooks@allisonmackenzie.com
9 10	MATTHEW C. ZIRZOW bankruptcynotices@gordonsilver.com
11	b. By United States mail, postage fully prepaid:
12	☐ c. <u>By Personal Service</u> I personally delivered the document(s) to the persons at these addresses:
13	For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made by handing the document(s) to the attorney or by leaving the document(s) at the attorney's office with a clerk or other person in charge, or if no one is in charge by leaving the document(s) in a conspicuous place
14	in the office.
15 16	For a party, delivery was made by handing the document(s) to the party or by leaving the document(s) at the person's dwelling house or usual place of abode with someone of suitable age and discretion residing there.
17 18 19	Based upon the written agreement to accept service by email or a court order, I caused the document(s) to be sent to the persons at the email addresses listed below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.
20	□ e. <u>By fax transmission</u>
21 22	Based upon the written agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission or a court order, I faxed the document(s) to the persons at the fax numbers listed
23	below. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. A copy of the record of the fax transmission is attached.
24	□ f. <u>By messenger</u>
25	I served the document(s) by placing them in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed below and providing them to a messenger for service.
26	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
27	Signed on: October 18, 2006
28	(Name of Declarant) S LIA DORSEY (Signature of Declarant)